

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the recitations of claims 3 and 9 therein, and claims 3 and 9 have been canceled accordingly. Claims 4, 5, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, and 18 have been amended so that they do not depend on a canceled claim. Claims 19-21 have been canceled to expedite allowance of this application. Also, the specification and claims have been amended to make grammatical changes and correct inadvertent errors, including amendments to resolve issues raised by the Examiner.

Entry of the above amendments is respectfully requested.

Objection to the Abstract

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to the abstract of the disclosure for various reasons.

In response, Applicant has amended the abstract to resolve the issues raised by the Examiner. In this regard, Applicant notes that the change from TAC to cellulose triacetate can be seen from the disclosure at page 8, line 5 in the present application.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that this objection has been overcome, and withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Objection to Claims 3 and 17

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to claims 3 and 17 for various reasons.

In response, Applicant has canceled claim 3 and amended claim 17 to resolve the issues raised by the Examiner.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that this objection has been overcome, and withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because it is unclear whether the method or the products are being claimed.

In response, Applicant has canceled claims 19-21 to expedite allowance of the present application.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the present claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claims are directed to neither a method of solution casting nor a product.

In response, Applicant has canceled claims 19-21 to expedite allowance of the present application.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the present claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Art Rejections

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 5, 15, 16, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Takeda (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0009312; published July 26, 2001; now U.S. Patent 6,582,645). In addition, on page 5 of the Office Action, claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Takeda (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0009312; published July 26, 2001; now U.S. Patent 6,582,645). Further, on page 7 of the Office Action, claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takeda (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0009312; published July 26, 2001; now U.S. Patent 6,582,645). Also, on page 7 of the Office Action, claims 7-14, 17 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takeda (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0009312; published July 26, 2001; now U.S. Patent 6,582,645) in view Tasaka et al. (U.S. Patent 6,814,914; issued November 9,2004; priority date May 30, 2001).

Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention is not anticipated by or obvious over the cited art, and requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw these rejections in view of the following remarks.

Initially, Applicant notes that claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the recitations of claims 3 and 9 therein. Since claim 9 was not rejected as anticipated by or obvious over Takeda alone, the anticipation and obviousness rejections over Takeda alone have been overcome.

Further, Applicant submits that Takeda specifically teaches that the peeling ability of the web is “considerably improved” when the remaining content of the solvent in the web is within

the range of 70 to 120% (see paragraph [0072]), and thus teaches away from the invention of claim 9 (which limits the weight percentage of the remaining solvent to at most 50%), since one would want a peeling ability that is considerably improved and would not want a peeling ability that is not considerably improved. While the Tasaka reference cited by the Examiner teaches a broad residual solvent amount range of 5 to 150% by weight in the last sentence of column 18, Applicant submits that such a range encompasses the narrower 70 to 120% range of Takeda and that when the references are combined, one would still use the 70 to 120% range since one would want a peeling ability that is considerably improved and would not want a peeling ability that is not considerably improved.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that the present invention is neither anticipated by nor obvious over the cited art. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 10/809,544

Attorney Docket No. Q80614

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Bruce E. Kramer
Registration No. 33,725

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 3, 2006